DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 466 323 EA 003 695

TITLE Florida State Annual Evaluation Report of Title I Projects: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. 1969-70 Fiscal Year.

INSTITUTION Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Agricultural Education Section.

PUB DATE [70]

NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Florida

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Florida State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and University personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (Pages 2,4,6,7,11,19,20, and 24 may reproduce poorly.) (EA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053466

FLORIDA

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TALLAHASSEE

FLOYD T. CHRISTIAN, COMMISSIONER

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

OF TITLE I PROJECTS

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

1969-70 FISCAL YEAR

EA 003 695

1. (A) Florida is divided into 67 operational LEAs. The boundries of these districts are coterminus with the boundries of the state's 67 counties.

(B) 63 LEAs participate in Title I activities.

(1) 7 LEAs participate during the regular school term only.

(2) No LEAs participate during the summer term only.

(3) 56 LEAs participate during the regular & summer school term.

(C) Each of the 63 participating LEA's operate one Title I program.

(D) A total of 103904 public school children and 3140 non-public school children participated in Title I activities during the 1969-70 school year. Additionally 452 out of school youth were served for a total participation of 107496. This number represents a reduction of 40% in the number of children participating during the 1968-69 school year.

2. Title I staff members have visited participating LEAs a total of 603 times during the 1969-70 school year. In addition to these individual visits 18 regional meetings were held. These regional meetings brought together LEA personnel with personnel from the Office of Federal-State Relations and other SEA personnel. The number and purpose of these visits for FY 1968 and FY 1969 are summarized in table 1.

TABLE I

1968

PURPOSE	NUMBER OF VISITS	% OF TOTAL
Planning	112	20%
Program Development	195	34%
Program Operation	175	31%
Evaluation	63	11%
Coordination	22	4%
TOTAL	567	100%

1969

PURPOSE	NUMBER OF VISITS	% OF TOTAL
Planning	128	22%
Program Development	226	37%
Program Operation	158	26%
Evaluation	61	10%
Coordination	30	5%
TOTAL	603	100%

While the effects of these visits are not immediately obvious nor are they ameniable to direct measurement we believe that the visits have been of great help to the smaller LEA's and of moderate help to the larger districts. When LEA administrators were sent a questionaire regarding quality of the services received from the Title I staff 34% responded that the services were excellent or of great value, 60% reported that they were satisfied with these services or that they were adequate and 6% recommended that additional services be provided. An indirect measure of the effectiveness of these visits is shown in item I-D. The focus of Title I programs have been narrowed in that the number of participants in Fy 1969 is only 60% of the participants in Fy 1968. This reduction came about as a result of 6 regional meetings and approximately 70 individual meetings with LEA personnel.

3. (A) During the last three years the SEA has made several changes in its procedures intended to improve the quality of Title I programs within Florida. In the past year the major change was to restrict the number of participants in Title I programs so as to narrow the focus and increase the effectiveness of Title I's compensatory education programs. This was accomplished by first producing and disseminating guidelines for the establishment of a maximum number of participants within each LEA. These guidelines were followed-up with a series of six regional meetings explaining the necessity for and the rational behind this reduction of participation. LEA project applications were reviewed and where necessary individual meetings between staff members of the LEA and the SEA were arranged to resolve difficulties.

Additionally we have instituted the requiring of a "prospectus" as a part of the LEA's application procedure. The LEA's are required to submit, three months before the normal application date, a prospectus of an application for funding of a Title I project. This prospectus must outline the purpose, target population, evaluation methods, budget, personnel, and equipment of the proposed project. The prospectus is then reviewed by the SDE staff members with areas needing additional information or justification being pointed out to the LEA's. The LEA's then are able to revise or modify their plans, incorporating changes into a final grant application that would enable them to provide improved services to the educationally deprived children of their area.

In addition there has been an administrative reorganization within the S.D.E. Eight general consultants were employed by the S.D.E. to travel throughout the state providing the LEA's with general consultative services and assistance in solving local educational problems. These men were originally employed in the Division of Curriculum and Instruction but they have been transferred to the Deputy Superintendent's division which allows for a close and much improved working relationship with the Office of Federal-State Relations, which is also under Deputy Superintendent, and reflects their growing involvement in the area of federal programs.

The Title I grant application forms have been modified so as to insure that the LEA's become involved in comprehensive educational planning. It is believed that this shift in format when coupled with the emphasis placed on planning by SDE staff members in both prospectus and application discussion with the LEA's will result in a more comprehensive and cohesive pattern of compensatory education within the State of Florida.

(B) It has only been within the past two years that the non-public schools have recognized the benefits available under Title I, ESEA and that the public schools have offered any services to non-public school children. The interest of the Roman Catholic schools in Title I which began in FY 1969 has continued to grow in FY 1970 and the proportion of non-public school students participating in Title I activities has continued to increase.

During the 1968-69 school year 4013 public school children participated in Title I activities. This number fell to 3140, as a result of declining non-public school enrollment and a reduced target population. This is, however, an increase from 2% to 3% of the total Title I participants. The SEA has issued guidelines advising the LEA's of their responsibilities to non-public school children and has continued to act as mediator between LEA's and non-public

school personnel to aid them in resolving some of the many problems associated with this very delicate area.

(C) As we indicated in last year's Title I report, little can be done to incorporate evaluation results within the Title I application process due to our current timetable. This is a particularly difficult problem as LEA grant applications are being processed and approved several months prior to the receipt of State Title I Evaluation Questions from the U.S.O.E. We have attempted to compensate for this by providing a tentative set of questions for the LEA's but even these are not returnable to the SDE until after the approval of the next year's program. Ignoring the problems involved, particularly the constraint of time, we are now attempting to structure an earlier evaluation report each year, with a final goal being an evaluation report available prior to the renewal and refunding of a project.

4. (A) The data in the twenty-two following tables give some indication of the effect of Title I activities upon the educational achievement of disadvantaged students. These tables report test data on 13 percent of the public school Title I participants, 21 percent of the non-public school Title I participants and approximately 18 percent of non-participants.

The data in these tables indicate that Title I programs have made a significant improvement in the academic achievement of target children. As the extent of improvement appears to decrease in the higher grades one could assume that the identification and provision of services to target children in the earliest (K-3) grades would provide the maximum benefit to the child and the greatest economy to the nation.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 1

Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE

Test: CLYMER-BARRETT PREREADING BATTERY

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	1614	1320	1302	1150	846	504	96	46	2	6880
Non-public Participants	8	26	48	88	50	74	14	6	2	316
Non-Participants	5	23	14	13	6	3	3	1	1	*69

Post-Test

Participants	152	184	322	694	1364	1910	1278	708	182	6794
Non-public Participants	0	4	10	16	66	70	94	50	6	316
Non-Participants	2911	5379	4212	5052	4939	3622	2042	1151	900	* 30208
Theoretical Norms										

*Non-participants tested using the Stanford Achievement Test (Word Meaning) with National Forms.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 2 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	141	144	117	48	27	12	3	0	0	492
Non-public Participants	66	90	22	8	2	2	2	0	0	192
Non-Participants	3956	3730	5328	4691	7433	5338	2531	1841	981	35829

Post-Test

Participants	27	66	165	132	90	54	33	12	18	597
Non-public Participants	4	30	30	30	40	36	10	18	16	214
Non-Participants	4476	3950	5770	4980	5327	3430	2407	1542	1881	33763
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 3

Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE

Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	490	396	126	114	24	0	6	0	0	1164
Non-public Participants	22	12	14	10	8	0	0	0	0	66
Non-Participants	2824	2966	4050	5330	7875	3240	1899	1072	447	29703

Post-Test

Participants	177	431	201	138	135	21	9	9	1	1129
Non-public Participants	12	8	22	18	28	8	2	4	0	102
Non-Participants	3380	5525	5278	8319	5907	3512	3082	1533	1427	37963
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 4 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	376	338	264	192	108	42	36	8	6	1370
Non-public Participants	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Non-Participants	2844	3824	4554	2543	4195	3491	2222	1020	391	25084

Post-Test

Participants	304	418	218	194	116	86	30	22	16	1404
Non-public Participants	6	2	2	10	0	4	0	2	0	26
Non-Participants	3953	5861	5504	5719	7117	3467	2735	1174	1276	36806
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 5

Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE

Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	704	240	212	104	42	2	2	2	2	710
Non-public Participants	2	8	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	22
Non-Participants	3651	2758	4338	5523	5354	3258	2238	1432	1368	29920

Post-Test

Participants	78	204	260	90	30	18	6	6	2	694
Non-public Participants	2	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Non-Participants	3107	4779	5536	8001	6492	4300	3169	1023	1253	37660
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 6 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	332	424	228	156	68	54	34	2	4	1302
Non-public Participants	6	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	17
Non-Participants	440	902	785	705	592	496	219	145	140	4424

Post-Test

Participants	272	372	444	140	82	66	38	10	8	1432
Non-public Participants	0	0	6	2	8	2	0	0	0	18
Non-Participants	2116	4746	6270	5652	4799	3337	3198	1442	1337	32897
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 7 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	126	230	128	54	12	4	2	0	0	556
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	3232	5245	7628	7126	5607	3717	2266	1595	590	37006

Post-Test

Participants	96	216	160	76	10	8	2	0	2	570
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	3182	5301	5870	5601	5794	4986	2855	1689	1190	36468
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 8 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	90	148	84	24	0	2	0	0	2	350
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	3768	7313	9255	9780	9924	6570	4962	3299	2101	56972

Post-Test

Participants	108	122	74	26	12	4	0	0	2	348
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	2238	4620	4811	3539	7765	4602	3040	1544	820	32979
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 9

Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE

Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	27	96	6	3	0	0	3	0	0	135
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	931	1390	1695	2820	3767	3001	2083	1663	576	17926

Post-Test

Participants	27	81	36	12	12	3	0	0	0	171
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	707	2031	2749	3539	3665	2886	1404	1171	571	18723
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 10 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	30	42	12	15	6	0	0	0	0	105
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	367	579	752	1129	1249	826	551	514	13	5980

Post-Test

Participants	18	54	27	9	15	3	6	3	0	135
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Nor-Participants	347	520	665	825	796	672	594	503	67	4989
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 11 Norms: National

Reported In: NUMBER IN STANINE Test: STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	36	66	9	12	3	0	0	0	0	126
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	330	551	719	837	868	756	623	524	56	5263

Post-Test

Participants	24	36	42	21	18	3	1	0	0	145
Non-public Participants	NOT AVAILABLE									
Non-Participants	255	286	350	446	637	478	573	127	32	3184
Theoretical Norms										

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 1

Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine

Test: Clymer Barrett Prereading Battery

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	23	19	19	17	12	07	01	01	00	
Non-public Participants	03	08	15	28	16	23	04	02	01	
Non-Participants **	07	33	21	19	10	04	04	01	01	

Post-Test

Participants	02	03	05	10	20	28	19	10	03	
Non-public Participants	00	01	03	05	21	22	30	16	02	
Non-Participants **	10	18	13	17	16	12	07	04	03	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

**Non-participants tested using the Stanford Achievement Test (Word Meaning) with National Norms.

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 2 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	29	29	24	10	05	02	01	00	00	
Non-public Participants	34	47	11	04	01	01	01	00	00	
Non-Participants	11	10	15	13	21	15	07	05	03	

Post-Test

Participants	05	11	28	22	15	09	05	02	03	
Non-public Participants	02	14	14	14	19	17	05	08	07	
Non-Participants	13	12	17	15	16	10	07	05	06	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 3 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	43	34	11	10	02	00	00	00	00	
Non-public Participants	33	18	21	15	12	00	00	00	00	
Non-Participants	10	10	14	18	27	11	06	04	02	

Post-Test

Participants	16	38	18	12	12	02	01	01	01	
Non-public Participants	12	08	22	18	28	08	02	04	00	
Non-Participants	10	15	14	22	16	09	08	04	04	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 4 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	27	25	19	14	08	03	03	01	00	
Non-public Participants	40	60	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	
Non-Participants	11	15	18	10	17	14	09	04	02	

Post-Test

Participants	22	30	15	14	08	06	02	02	01	
Non-public Participants	23	08	08	38	00	15	00	08	00	
Non-Participants	11	16	16	16	19	09	07	03	04	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 5 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	15	34	30	15	06	00	00	00	00	
Non-public Participants	09	36	27	09	00	00	00	00	00	
Non-Participants	12	09	14	19	18	11	07	05	05	

Post-Test

Participants	11	29	37	13	04	03	01	01	00	
Non-public Participants	10	70	20	00	00	00	00	00	00	
Non-Participants	08	13	15	21	17	11	08	03	03	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 6

Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine

Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	26	33	17	12	05	04	03	00	00	
Non-public Participants	35	24	35	06	00	00	00	00	00	
Non-Participants	10	20	18	16	13	11	05	03	03	

Post-Test

Participants	19	26	31	10	06	05	03	01	00	
Non-public Participants	00	00	33	11	44	11	00	00	00	
Non-Participants	06	14	19	17	15	10	10	04	04	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 8

Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine

Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	26	42	24	07	00	01	00	00	01	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	07	13	16	17	17	12	09	06	04	

Post-Test

Participants	31	35	21	07	03	01	00	00	01	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	07	14	15	11	24	13	09	05	02	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 9 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	20	71	04	02	00	00	02	00	00	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	05	08	10	16	21	17	12	09	03	

Post-Test

Participants	15	46	21	07	07	02	00	00	00	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	04	11	15	19	20	15	07	06	03	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 10 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	29	40	11	14	06	00	00	00	00	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	06	10	13	19	21	14	09	09	00	

Post-Test

Participants	13	40	20	07	11	02	04	02	00	
Non-public Participants	Not available									
Non-Participants	07	10	13	17	16	13	12	10	01	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Grade: 11 Norms: National

Reported In: Percent in Stanine Test: Stanford Achievement Test

Pre-Test

Stanine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Participants	28	52	07	09	02	00	00	00	00	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	06	10	14	16	16	14	12	10	01	

Post-Test

Participants	17	25	29	14	12	02	01	00	00	
Non-public Participants	Not Available									
Non-Participants	08	09	11	14	20	15	18	04	01	
Theoretical Norms	04	07	12	17	20	17	12	07	04	

4. (B) This year, for the first time, many (43%) of Florida's LEAs report a positive relationship between program effectiveness and program cost. We believe that this acknowledgement has been caused by the reduction of the number of Title I participants. LEAs are finding that there is a greater per pupil increase in performance when a given amount of money is used to provide service to a smaller number of children.

A survey of LEAs indicates that the most effective Title I programs include sound planning, strong leadership and good teacher acceptance, inservice training, parental involvement and smaller classes with a greater degree of individualization. To be effective, the program must be fully budgeted and have access to support personnel and material when and as required. Attached, as addenda to this section are statements from four of our largest LEAs regarding the characteristics of their more effective programs.

D-6

COUNTY Broward

1969-1970

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Please explain below if your county has found: 1) any evidence that there is a relationship between program effectiveness and program cost or, 2) that your more effective Title I programs have certain characteristics in common. Please indicate the nature of the relationship or characteristics and the methods used to observe or measure them.

1. After initial cost, because of staff utilization, coordination, and a more economic use of materials, the cost factor relationship to program effectiveness is a more economic approach than in most Reading Clinics.

STAFF UTILIZATION

The expertise of each staff member is utilized through a Team Teaching Approach. The prime concern is to utilize the staff, facility, equipment amd materials in a manner that not only provides a climate which assures personalized success for each child but organizes materials within several teams, thus eliminating unnecessary duplication.

Many consummable materials have been re-organized into Kit-type materials lending themselves more effectively to an individualized program as well as a more economic use.

PARA PROFESSIONALS

By the use of para professionals more students are served more economically than in a program employing only professional teachers. The practice of employing teacher aides, whose function is to assist teachers, is based on the assumption that relieving teachers of various routine chores will allow them more time to engage in the professional activities for which they are uniquely qualified.

ECONOMY OF TIME AS RELATED TO PROGRESS

Because students progress in the Title I Reading Program at twice the rate as in their regular classroom, the program is economically more feasible.

2. Characteristics of Program Effectiveness which are related to cost:

Competency of Staff
Specialized Courses
Specialized Training
Specialized Experience

Personnel Effective in Specific Roles
Administrative Roles
Program Coordinating Roles
Specialized Instructing Roles
Para Professional Roles
Clerical and Secretarial Roles

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS (continued)

Continuous In-Service

Cost For Consultants

Cost For Time

Equipment and Materials-Initial Cost Primarily

Time For Planning-Cost Factor

Methods Used to Measure the Characteristics of Program Effectiveness.

Facility: Continuous evaluation and innovation in regard to the best utilization of furniture and space as well as the various function areas of the Reading Center.

Staff: Evaluation forms required at the county and state level and periodic administrative assessment. Also staff self-evaluation by teams. On going self-evaluation of teams and individual team members.

Program: Standardized tests are used to measure intelligence and reading achievement. A review of research conducted by the Broward County Board of Education Research Department reveals that the Reading Center Program produces gains in reading achievement. More importantly, it has been found that these gains are still maintained on year after pupils complete the program.

Diagnostic test results, informal inventories and check lists are analyzed and form the basis for prescribing each individual child's remedial program.

A Behavioral Rating form is sent to the classroom teachers at the time a child enrolls in the Reading Center program. Another is sent when the student is released. This information is used to determine to what extent the program influences a child's behavior. This data also proves valuable in identifying the characteristics of children who profit most and least from the program.

D-6

COUNTY Dade

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Please explain below if your county has found: 1) any evidence that there is a relationship between program effectiveness and program cost or, 2) that your more effective Title I programs have certain characteristics in common. Please indicate the nature of the relationship or characteristics and the methods used to observe or measure them.

The 1969-70 data have not been completely analyzed. Available evidence from previous evaluations indicates that there is probably a positive relationship between program effectiveness and program cost. (The most effective project has always had the highest per-pupil expenditure.) There also appears to be a positive relationship between effectiveness and the employment of individualized or small group instruction. (The more effective projects have all employed individualized or small group instruction.)

The effectiveness of the projects were determined by using the pre-test post-test gain versus projected gain and by using experimental-versus-control experimental designs.

D-6

COUNTY Duval

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Please explain below if your county has found: 1) any evidence that there is a relationship between program effectiveness and program cost or, 2) that your more effective Title I programs have certain characteristics in common. Please indicate the nature of the relationship or characteristics and the methods used to observe or measure them.

It has been found that our more effective Title I programs have three characteristics in common; strong leadership, a good in-service training program, and flexibility of approach in meeting objectives.

The coordinators of these programs have planned carefully and followed all phases of their programs closely.

The participating teachers were given intensive, continuous in-service training which not only introduced them to new materials, techniques and methods to be used in the programs but also emphasized the philosophy that each child is capable of achieving success. As a result, these teachers are committed to the idea that every child can learn.

The objectives were clearly stated and the activities designed to meet them. Those activities which in the previous year's evaluation were not considered to be contributing to successful program accomplishment were either discarded or modified, new activities were instituted and those activities producing desired outcomes were continued.

A relationship between program effectiveness and program cost has been found in the D I S C U S project. The cost per participating pupil in this Title I program is $28.45. Its effectiveness is demonstrated by data in Parts II and III of the Title I evaluation.

COUNTY Pinellas

CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Please explain below if your county has found: 1) any evidence that there is a relationship between program effectiveness and program cost or, 2) that your more effective Title I programs have certain characteristics in common. Please indicate the nature of the relationship or characteristics and the methods used to observe or measure them.

1. There seems to be evidence of definite relationship between program affectiveness and program costs. In earlier years of ESEA, Title I, programs were designed to serve all identified children which spread expenditure over some 12,000 children in Pinellas County. When approximately the same amount of money was concentrated on less than 4,000 children (1969-70) effectiveness increased.

2. In analyzing those activities which were most successful in facilitating effective student outcome, the following characteristics were identified:

   a. Emphasis was upon process and not content.
   b. Focus was on the individual child and his frame of reference.
   c. Teachers, specialists and/or aides used positive statements much more frequently than negative statements when relating to children.
   d. Stable limits (rules) for each activity were developed with the assistance of students and frequently were posted so all could see.
   e. Each child was frequently and consistently praised for his effort and his behavior considered appropriate for him.
   f. Children were encouraged to assume responsibility for their own learning and for their classroom behavior.
   g. Parents were encouraged to become involved with their children's educational experiences.

5. The effect of the Title I program upon the administrative structure and the educational practices of the SEA are reported in the answer to question 3.

Title I's effect on the administrative structure of the LEAs has been limited to two areas. First, each LEA has employed a full time person to coordinate federal programs. In the smaller districts one person coordinates all federal programs while in the larger LEAs this function is distributed among several people. Secondly, Title I has demonstrated the value of skilled supervision and has led to the wide-spread employment of area supervisors and curriculum coordinators.

In the area of educational practices many changes are attributed to Title I. This year, however, a majority of the LEAs have reported that the greatest effect of Title I has been to increase efforts to coordinate school and community programs to reach the disadvantaged and to increase emphasis on staff development and inservice training. The coordination of programs within school systems and with other non-school agencies was forced upon the LEAs by Title I. Over the five year life of ESEA the LEAs have come to recognize the value of this coordination and have expanded it to many non-federal programs. The increased effectiveness of Title I teachers and staff has demonstrated the value of staff development. As a result of Title I, many LEAs

now have complete, district wide, staff development and inservice training programs.

The LEAs have also reported that due to the leadership of Title I, student-teacher ratios have been reduced, early childhood programs have been developed, and para-professional employees have been more effectively utilized.

6. (A) During the 1969-1970 year Florida did not provide state funds to augment Title I programs or to provide special compensatory education programs. However, a compensatory education bill was introduced in the 1970 session of the state legislature for the first time. This bill died on the calender at the end of the session, but it is significant to note that data supplied by the Title I office was valuable in securing its committee passage.

(B) Attached, as addenda to this section, are four examples of coordination of Title I with other programs. These reports are from two large LEAs, Broward and Duval counties, one medium size LEA--Pasco County, and one small LEA--Calhoun County

D-7
Attachment A

County Duval

The Title I kindergarten program provides an excellent example of the coordination of effort for the purpose of providing benefits to the educationally deprived child.

Title III S E A R C H was coordinated and supervised by Title I kindergarten staff using some techniques first developed in Title I kindergartens. Follow Through, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, was then implemented utilizing methods and techniques developed by the S E A R C H project and medical, dental, and social services coordinated through the Title I kindergarten project. In this program, selected children are followed from the Parent Child Center through Full Year Head Start, and into Follow Through which serves children K - 2. The next step was the addition of the Teacher Corps component to the Follow Through program. Teacher Corps provides university and in-service training specifically geared to the education of the deprived child.

Another example of coordination of effort is found in the Career Opportunities Program funded under EPDA. This program provides paraprofessionals an opportunity to secure a college degree in the field of education. Eighty-five percent of our Title I teacher aides are taking advantage of this opportunity. The ultimate beneficiaries of their education will be the children they serve.

D-7

COUNTY Broward
1969-1970

COORDINATION OF EFFORTS

The U. S. Office of Education is seeking "outstanding" or "superior" examples of the coordination of Title I efforts with those of other federally funded programs. If you believe that your effort has been outstanding please describe your program fully, including the identity of other programs and agencies involved and how these efforts are brought to bear upon the problems of reaching the educationally deprived child.

The basic purpose of the Title i Reading Clinics has been to help individual students and to support and assist the classroom teachers in improving reading and language skills throughout the school system. These centers are located in strategic economic and geographic areas throughout the county and serve as a focal point for in-service, diagnosis and remediations, dissemination of infromation, and a community facility. Groups from outside the state have visited for suggestions in construction center for the non-conference year in connection with the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference of the Florida Education Association.

Coordination With Other Federally Funded Programs

Staff members have served as consultants, assisted in workshops, seminars and in-service programs with the following programs:

Migrant Education
Cooperated with this program through the utilization of this staff and its resources in the pre- and in- service migrant staff- development workshop for the improvement of educational opportunities for migrants.

Migrant Kindergarten
Assisted with program

Civil Rights Pilot Program (1966-1967)
Involved in setting up and implementing a program to provide seminars in specialized problems in administration, guidance, reading, language in four multicultural schools.

Foster Grandparents Program
Employed personnel from this program

Headstart
Assisted in an advisory, consultant capacity, as well as involvement in program implementation.
Assisted in television coverage.

COORDINATION OF EFFORTS (continued)

Other Agencies:

The Center has been involved in receiving and giving assistance with the following:

Optometrist - Opthamologist
University Reading Clinics
Private Reading Clinics
Office of Economic Opportunity
Broward County Health Department
Henderson Clinic of Broward County
Floirda State Department of Public Welfare
Bureau of Blind Services

COUNTY Pasco

COORDINATION OF EFFORTS

The U. S. Office of Education is seeking "outstanding" or "superior" examples of the coordination of Title I efforts with those of other federally funded programs. If you believe that your effort has been outstanding please describe your program fully, including the identity of other programs and agencies involved and how these efforts are brought to bear upon the problems of reaching the educationally deprived child.

We feel that our health program is superior and that coordination and cooperation between the Pasco County Health offices and the school system is outstanding.

Our county contracts for health services which includes pre observation, follow up work with the families of those students involved. In close work with our school coordinator of Health, the county health services include: Hospitalization, medical, dental, medication, psychological examinations, transportation, and health education.

Our program, while paying for the services of three nurses, enjoys the benefits of nine full time nurses. The nurses are involved in both school site services and home visit services.

Through the home visits of the county nurses many community health problems have been identified and in most cases, corrected. According to school health records, teacher observations, and reports by school personnel health problems of the target students (and others in the community) are not as great as they have been in previous years. Evidences of fewer internal parasites, fewer infectious skin problems, and increased red blood count indicate that efforts of the health department are effective. Many problems still exist, but it is the concensus of opinion that much is being accomplished both in the identification of health problems and in the treatment of those problems.

A great effort is underway in our county for more effective health education programs. Nurses spend many hours in the actual teaching of health in the homes of students. Films, lectures, disscussion, and personal help are integral with our total health program. Teachers and nurses work closely in an effort to prevent problems before they cause problems for the student or the student's family.

Nurses, teachers, and administrators agree that there is plenty left to be done, but all feel that great strides have been made during the past few years towards better health for all Pasco County students and their families.

Information gained from nurses often helps change teacher attitude concerning certain children as has been shown by increased teacher visits in the homes of many students.

The contracted services permitted by Title I has been instrumental if the rapport which has been developed between the school and the health service.

D-7.

COUNTY Calhoun

COORDINATION OF EFFORTS

The U. S. Office of Education is seeking "outstanding" or "superior" examples of the coordination of Title I efforts with those of other federally funded programs. If you believe that your effort has been outstanding please describe your program fully, including the identity of other programs and agencies involved and how these efforts are brought to bear upon the problems of reaching the educationally deprived child.

Services from the County Health Department, Social Welfare Department, local doctor, State-Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Service, and local school personnel have been more adequately extended to helping Title I children. One outstanding example is given below:

A Title I identified student in Grade 12 in a local school had a history of absenteeism since the 9th grade having transferred to a Senior High School from a much smaller Jr. High School. The non-attendance was due to withdrawal tendencies and shyness brought about primarily by her low self concept and the way she felt about how she physically appeared to other people. This girl has an older sister and younger sister who have higher intellectual ability than she has. The older sister completed college and the younger sister is an "A" student, while the girl herself with average ability is a "C" and "D" student.

The family is very poor with income from Welfare and another sister who is working outside the home. The Father was in ill health for a number of years and died about four years ago.

During the school year, the school counselor made efforts to improve the subject's self concept and way of life. From these efforts came the following activities:

1. A local doctor gave a free medical examination as needed.
2. The Welfare Department upon referral carried the girl to a special clinic for further medical examinations.
3. The local Health Department made home visits.
4. The Vocational Rehabilitation Program provided in depth counseling.
5. The District Mental Health Association continued these counseling services.

The result of all these efforts is the girl is enrolling in college for the coming year. She has a long way to go, but she has a good start. After realizing that she would not initiate any type of conversation, ask no questions, felt secure only in a room at home, looked on herself as being inferior among other handicaps; one notes that she has already come through a difficult period in her life.

7. When examined quantitatively, Title I programs have been successful in bringing compensatory education to children enrolled in non-public schools. Due to a reduction in non-public school enrollment and the narrowing of the Title I focus, the absolute number (unduplicated) of Title I participants fell from four thousand and thirteen in the 1968-1969 school year to three thousand one hundred forty in the 1969-1970 school year. However, while the public schools reduced the level of their participation by 40%, the non-public school participation was reduced by only 22%. In fact, non-public school students made up 2% of the Title I participants in the 1968-1969 school year and 3% of the Title I participants during the past school year. It has also been reported by the LEA that the Title I participant count by activity (duplicated) has increased by 4%.

Qualitatively the Title I offerings to non-public school children are strong in that the non-public school participant receives the same services as does the participant from a public school. For the most part, difficulty arises from the fact that the program must be brought to the child due to scheduling and transportation difficulties. This does lead to some inequalities and offering limitations, but taking the limits of scheduling, space, and time into consideration, the programs provided to non-public school students is comparable to programs available to public school students.

Seventy per cent of LEAs reported an operational non-public school within their district. Of these, all offered services to the non-public schools and services were utilized by the non-public schools in 86% of the districts. The other 14% indicate that the non-public school either were not eligible for services, their students did not need offered services, or they simply refused the offered services.

Efforts at coordination and the encouragement of joint planning of Title I projects begun last year have continued through the 1969-1970 school year. The Office of Federal State Relations has continued to encourage LEAs to involve non-public school personnel in all phases of program development from planning to evaluation. Several conferences have been arranged between the personnel of the larger LEAs, the SEA, and agencies such as the Florida Catholic Conference. The purposes of these meetings have been both specific and general. General, in that they were used in the attempt to open lines of communication and encourage cooperation and, specific in that each meeting had at its focus some specific problem area. Services made available to non-public school children were essentially the same as those offered to children attending public schools. The only modifications reported by the LEAs minor scheduling changes and the placing of some materials in the non-public schools. Details as to the participation of non-public school students in Title I programs appear in the following table.

PARTICIPATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

IN TITLE I PROGRAMS*

Service	Time	Day	Term	Number of Participants
Reading	1-2-3	1	2	3159
Visits to Educational Farm	1-2	1	2	1952
Language Arts	1-2	1	2	1678
In-Service Training	1-2	1	1-2	790
Museum & Planetarium Trips	1-2	1	2	737
Speech Therapy	1-2	1	1	641
Summer School	1-2	1	1	296
Visiting Teachers	1-2	1	2	290
Hearing Tests	1-2	1	2	277
A-V Materials	1-2	1	2	252
Remedial Math	1-2	1	2	140
Library Service	1-2	1	2	129
Health Service	1-2	1	2	45
Reading Resource Teacher	1-2	1		43
Food Service	1-2	1		25
Total				10454*

* Not an unduplicated count

CODES:

TIME 1=8 A.M. to Noon 2= Noon to 3 P.M. 3=3P.M. to 10P.M.
DAY 1=School Days 2="Weekends
TERM 1=Summer School Term 2=Regular School Term

8. Of 52 LEA's responding to a survey regarding joint training of teachers and teachers aides nine (17%) reported that they did not employ aides, thirty-nine (75%) reported that they employed aides in their Title I program and four (8%) reported the joint training of teachers and aides funded under some non-Title I program.

The general pattern of activities within these joint training programs can be seen in the following summary of topics covered in individual programs as reported by the operating LEA's.

TOPIC	NUMBER OF LEA's REPORTING
Discussion of Duties & Responsibilities	25
Operation of A-V Equipment	14
Professional-Non-professional Relationship	11
Child Development	10
Clerical Duties & Procedures	10
Preparation of A-V Materials	8
School Law	6
Techniques in Reaching the Child	6
Curriculum Overview	6
Explanation of Compensatory Education Programs	5
Testing & Evaluation	5
First Aid	4
Philosophy of Teaching	4
Characteristics of the Disadvantaged	4

In addition several LEA's added specialized training such as: hearing and vision testing, team teaching, interpersonal relations, exceptional children, speech therapy and desegregation which fit particular or specific local needs. A description of Broward County's joint training program is attached to this section.

The table below indicates the number of teachers and teacher aides participating in each training project and the length of the course of training.

Participation in Coordinated Training Program

Name of County	Number of Participating Teachers	Number of Participating Teachers Aides	Length of Course in Hours
Alachua	30	39	40
Brevard	33	6	120
Broward	25	12	240
Calhoun	--	22	8
Charlotte	73	26	6
Clay	--	10	35
Columbia	--	29	40
Dade	215	126	41
DeSota	7	17	70
Duval	114	86	90
Escambia	80	30	7
Gulf	--	20	6
Hamilton	20	30	30
Hardee	10	37	9
Hendry	81	11	15
Highlands	6	14	80
Holmes	20	35	12
Indian River	21	21	26
Levy	187	18	16
Madison	206	32	16
Manatee	5	23	92
Nassau	298	23	18
Orange	20	28	60
Osceola	5	5	5
Palm Beach	--	16	12
Pasco	10	36	16
Pinellas	75	96	3
Polk	38	14	90
St. Johns	11	16	120
St. Lucie	--	40	8
Sarasota	48	40	15
Seminole	37	20	15
Sumter	--	19	48
Sumter	--	13	48
Washington	30	15	16
TOTAL	1713	1018	Mean =42.1 hr Median =22.0 hr

D-10

COUNTY Broward

1969-1970

TEACHER AIDES

Did you employ (in F.Y. 1970) any teacher aides who were paid from Title I funds?

X YES _____ NO

If yes, how many aides did you employ? (include both full and part time employees) 15

Did you as a county operate, or fund, or participate in a joint teacher-teacher aide training program prior to August 30, 1970? (Disregard the source of funds)

X YES _____ NO

If yes, how many teachers attended? 25

How many teacher aides attended? 12

What was the length of the training program? 240 hours

What activities or topics were included?

1. Problems of the disadvantaged child as they relate to school adjustments.
2. Philosophy and goals of this program in promoting a favorable climate for self-concept and academic adjustment.
3. Child growth and development as it relates to varied behaviors of children
4. Role of teachers and teacher aides in a team approach to remedial teaching.
5. Storytelling and reading with children. Utilizing games and gimmicks in the individualization of reading.

What, if anything, would you change about your training program?

1. A continuous training program with semi-monthly study and discussion.
2. More emphasis on study of materials and their effectiveness with particular children.
3. Training for assisting in development of materials for use with a specific learning style of child.
4.
5.

If you believe that this was an outstanding or extremely effective program, please indicate the basis for your judgement and attach more detailed description of the organization, operation and curriculum of the program.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

COUNTY Broward
1969-1970

TEACHER AIDES (continued)

As a result of this training program both teacher and teacher aides have become more effective as a teaching team.

The program is organized so that the teacher aide is an integral part of an instructional team responsible for:

1. Providing a positive environment for the pupils.
2. Providing remedial activities geared to the individual child's stage of development in reading and language skills.
3. Implementing a program structure that more effectively personalizes instruction for each child.
4. Employing motivational techniques, instructional strategy, and a continuous assessment methodology relevant to the learning styles of the learners.

The teaching teams work harmoniously together. Teacher aides work closely with the teachers in daily planning sessions, in reinforcement instructional activities, in preparation of materials and activities for daily lessons, and in the study of innovative techniques for improvement of the program.

9. In the area of community and parental involvement in educational planning and operations, Title I programs are the pace setters for the state. Non-Title I Programs, operated by Florida LEAs are approximately three years behind the Title I programs regarding parental involvement. Prior to FY 1968, the only community involvement in educational program was either initiated by community members or was informational with school personnel making speeches and presentations to local groups. In 1968, Title I programs began utilizing Lay Advisory Committees and this practice has spread, until in the current year only ten LEA's do not have a functional Lay Advisory Committee. Approximately one half of the districts with committees now report that they also utilize Lay Advisory Committees in other, non-Title I areas.

The following chart indicates the proportion of representatives appointed to Advisory Committees from various segments of the community. The proportion are computed from the reports of 51 of the 67 LEAs in the state and include 437 committee members.

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION ON LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Segment of the Community	% of Representation
School Administrators	34.2
Parents	30.1
Teachers	9.2
Community Action Agencies	6.0
Welfare Agencies	5.6
Business	5.1
Non-Public schools	4.5
Religious organizations	1.8
Governmental Agencies	1.3
Housewives	1.0
School Board Members	.7
Legal Professions	.5
TOTAL	100%

Parents of Title I target children were involved in some aspect of the Title I program in 96% of reporting LEAs. The following table indicates the nature and extent of parental involvement in Title I project by county.

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Alachua	Baker	Bay	Bradford	Brevard	Broward	Calhoun	Charlotte	Citrus
Participating in a Program	Yes	0	0	0	0	50	0	8	0
Employed on a Project	0	0	20	0	0	10	40	6	0
Volunteer Workers	Yes	0	25	0	0	35	0	25	0
Participants in Planning Project	Yes	0	5	Yes	8	6	0	6	0
To Disseminate Information	Yes	0	0	0	30	50	40	15	0
To Recruit Students & Staff	0	0	5	0	0	4	0	12	0
Invited Visits To Project	Yes	0	0	0	35	110	50	30	0
Staff Visits Parent at Home	Yes	0	10	Yes	20	50	100	3	500
Other	Yes	0	0	Yes	0	0	0	0	0
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No.	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Clay	Collier	Columbia	Dade	De Soto	Dixie	Duval	Escambia	Flagler
Participating in a Program	15	0	5	490	0	5	791	0	0
Employed on a Project	15	0	0	72	0	15	8	0	0
Volunteer Workers	35	0	0	249	0	5	65	100	0
Participants in Planning Project	15	25	Yes	184	Yes	10	107	0	16
To Disseminate Information	250	30	450	343	0	0	50	0	20
To Recruit Students & Staff	0	0	Yes	32	0	10	0	0	10
Invited Visits To Project	87	200	260	2184	Yes	20	2693	Yes	50
Staff Visits Parent at Home	150	100	86	2575	0	5	1820	Yes	50
Other	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Franklin	Gadsden	Gilchrist	Glades	Gulf	Hamilton	Hardee	Hendry	Hernando
Participating in a Program	25	0	0	31	15	0	0	0	15
Employed on a Project	0	35	0	0	2	0	8	0	0
Volunteer Workers	20	0	0	12	0	0	30	0	25
Participants in Planning Project	15	0	0	3	4	0	5	9	5
To Disseminate Information	55	250	0	31	30	0	5	0	50
To Recruit Students & Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Invited Visits To Project	125	Yes	20	42	25	0	15	40	150
Staff Visits Parent at Home	35	0	10	5	84	0	200	30	300
Other	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Highlands	Hillsborough	Holmes	Indian River	Jackson	Jefferson	Lafayette	Lake	Lee
Participating in a Program	0	0	0	0	45	15	0	127	0
Employed on a Project	10	0	35	0	0	15	0	0	0
Volunteer Workers	18	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	50
Participants in Planning Project	6	14	Yes	8	0	0	0	11	0
To Disseminate Information	30	0	Yes	15	0	0	0	168	0
To Recruit Students & Staff	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Invited Visits To Project	12	500	200	30	500	25	0	670	200
Staff Visits Parent at Home	20	3000	0	25	0	0	0	44	150
Other	0	30	Yes	0	0	0	0	Yes	0
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	No	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	0	No	No

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Leon	Levy	Liberty	Madison	Manatee	Marion	Martin	Monroe	Nassau
Participating in a Program	0	0	0	0	35	0	15	0	4
Employed on a Project	0	0	0	0	10	0	4	0	0
Volunteer Workers	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	10
Participants in Planning Project	5	0	6	0	10	7	10	Yes	5
To Disseminate Information	Yes	Yes	15	0	25	7	10	Yes	2
To Recruit Students & Staff	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	3
Invited Visits To Project	Yes	36	20	Yes	72	10	Yes	Yes	25
Staff Visits Parent at Home	Yes	124	25	0	236	0	25	Yes	4
Other	0	0	0	0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	0
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Okaloosa	Okeechobee	Orange	Osceola	Palm Beach	Pasco	Pinellas	Polk	Putnam
Participating in a Program	98	0	430	0	180	0	1200	200	0
Employed on a Project	9	0	4	5	15	0	111	0	0
Volunteer Workers	44	0	35	0	0	20	0	200	0
Participants in Planning Project	12	0	6	5	0	0	20	150	10
To Disseminate Information	52	0	10	10	0	60	20	300	25
To Recruit Students & Staff	0	0	90	10	0	7	0	0	0
Invited Visits To Project	134	0	163	0	120	108	1100	600	10
Staff Visits Parent at Home	21	0	414	2	40	26	10	300	20
Other	Yes	0	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parents are not Involved	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	St. Johns	St. Lucie	Santa Rosa	Sarasota	Seminole	Sumter	Suwannee	Taylor	Union
Participating in a Program	0	100	0	150	25	234	0	0	0
Employed on a Project	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0
Volunteer Workers	0	4	0	150	0	46	0	0	0
Participants in Planning Project	9	0	7	20	0	29	Yes	0	Yes
To Disseminate Information	4	220	0	20	0	334	Yes	0	0
To Recruit Students & Staff	1	108	0	0	0	10	0	0	0
Invited Visits To Project	30	70	20	90	45	539	Yes	0	Yes
Staff Visits Parent at Home	20	11	25	50	135	37	0	0	0
Other	0	Yes	0	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	No
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	0	No

NUMBER OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN TITLE I PROGRAMS BY COUNTY

	Volusia	Wakulla	Walton	Washington		Total			
Participating in a Program	16	0	0	0		4324			
Employed on a Project	4	12	25	6		507			
Volunteer Workers	12	0	0	0		1225			
Participants in Planning Project	6	5	10	10		815			
To Disseminate Information	6	80	0	50		3169			
To Recruit Students & Staff	0	0	0	5		331			
Invited Visits To Project	223	0	0	100		11788			
Staff Visits Parent at Home	650	0	0	25		11572			
Other	0	0	0	0					
Parents are not Involved	No	No	No	No					
Title I Lay Committee	Yes	Yes	No	Yes					